

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoshino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,438,582) (hereinafter "Hoshino"). Claims 3-8, 11 and 12 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that a novel feature of the present invention, as described in the combination of independent claim 1, is that the correcting signal generating unit generates a correction signal for offsetting a tilt of a waveform level of the recording light, and that the driving signal generating unit supplies the corrected driving signal to the light source. As described in the specification of the instant application, a semiconductor laser is provided, more particularly, a semiconductor laser capable of a high-power output, having a characteristic that results in the laser output waveform having a tilt.

In this respect, Applicants respectfully submit that the information recording apparatuses and methodologies, as described in the instant application's claims, generate the correction signal for offsetting the tilt, and generate the corrected laser driving signal based on the strategy signal and the correction signal. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that the tilt of the laser output waveform can be corrected, and the recording quality is ensured.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 are rejected as being anticipated by Hoshino. However, it is Applicants' opinion that Hoshino fails to teach or suggest at least the "correction signal generating unit which generates a correction signal for offsetting a tilt of a waveform level of the recording light," and the "driving signal generating unit which generates a corrected

driving signal ... based on the strategy signal and the correction signal,” as specifically described in the combination of features of independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hoshino is directed to a laser power monitor circuit for monitoring the power of the laser light of the magneto-optical disk device and the like. In the disk device of Hoshino, recording corrections are performed at the start of the pedestal power and write power of the laser, as shown by the broken line in Fig. 6 (more particularly, LD light generation waveform), to properly form the recording marks. However, Applicants respectfully submit that this correction may prevent the laser power monitor circuit from accurately monitoring the laser power. In this view, Hoshino employs the reverse correction circuit to negate the above correction, thereby to accurately monitor the laser power. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that although the device of Hoshino corrects the laser power monitoring signal by the reverse correction circuit, it does not correct the laser driving signal which is supplied and used to drive the laser source such as a laser diode.

In contrast, Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application, as described, for example, in independent claim 1, aims to correct the laser driving signal, particularly correct the tilt of the laser waveform level of the laser driving signal. Therefore, the correction signal generating unit generates the correction signal for offsetting the tilt, and the driving signal generating unit generates the corrected driving signal, by using the correction signal, to be supplied to the light source as the input signal. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Hoshino fails to teach or suggest the correction signal generating unit and the driving signal generating unit as specifically described in the combination of features of independent claim 1 of the instant application.

Applicants respectfully submit further that because Hoshino shows no indication of even being aware of the problem of the laser waveform level tilt, one having ordinary skill in the subject art could not reach the above-mentioned novel feature of the present invention from the teaching of Hoshino. Therefore, Applicants believe that independent claim 1 is patentable over Hoshino.

Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining independent claim 9 includes similar features as discussed above with regard to independent 1. Accordingly, similar arguments, as set forth above with regard to independent claim 1, also apply to independent claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Hoshino neither teaches nor suggests each feature of independent claims 1 and 9. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claims 1 or 9 and the reasons set forth above.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 3-8, 11 and 12, while objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claims 1 or 9 and the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to these claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

By: 

Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: March 12, 2007

Customer No. 55694

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005-1209

Tel.: (202) 842-8800

Fax: (202) 842-8465